[29th November 1928

(*f*) whether it is a fact that by taking into account for purposes of daily allowance the work turned out by the karnams irrespective of their actual stay at the headquarters they are generally given daily allowance for only half the number of days of their halt; and

(*g*) whether Government will be pleased to pay karnams attending to settlement work at headquarters a daily allowance of at least one rupee a day and proper travelling batta?

A.—(*a*) As attendance at Settlement offices forms part of the ordinary duties of karnams, the case is doubtless as suggested in the question.

(*b*) The Government are not aware that this is so.

(*c*) & (*d*) The Government are not aware whether the karnams are required to maintain diaries, attendance registers, etc., but even if they were so controlled during the period of their work in the Settlement office that circumstances would not be any reason for constituting them whole-time servants.

(*e*) Karnams employed in Settlement offices are paid a daily batta of four annas a day and a lump sum remuneration of Rs. 10 when the fair accounts of their villages are satisfactorily and finally completed. No travelling allowance is paid to them as attendance at Settlement offices forms part of their ordinary duties.

(*f*) The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested.

(*g*) The Government are not convinced that it is necessary to grant travelling allowance or increased daily allowance as suggested.

Water-rate

Collection of water cess from the ryots of Kontivada village.

*931 Q.—Mr. D. Narayana Raju: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Board of Revenue in their order No. 1269, dated 14th May 1879, authorized the proprietor of Kontivada to collect water cess from the ryots;

(*b*) if the answer to (*a*) be in the affirmative, what extent of land was under irrigation in 1879 over and above the mamul wet area with regard to which the proprietor was authorized to collect water charge from the ryots;

(*c*) whether the proprietor has been collecting wet rentals from the ryots since 1879;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the total rental of Kontivada village was only Rs. 4,928–1–2 before the year 1879 and that, after 1879, it has been increased to Rs. 7,261–7–6;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the proprietor has issued wet pattas to the ryots with the stipulation that they should have to pay water charge to Government only for second crop irrigation; and

(*f*) if the answer to (*e*) be in the affirmative, whether the Government are aware that the proprietor is willing to make, in respect of lands covered by the said wet pattas, a reduction of rent equal to the water charge which Government may collect from the ryots as a result of the proposed transfer?

A.—A report has been called for.

[For further list of starred questions please see page 467 infra.]